

REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are pending.

Claims 1-20 are rejected.

The non-final office action dated 3 June 2010 indicates that base claims 1 and 18 are rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Brady U.S. Patent No. 7,114,171 in view of Furon U.S. Publication No. 20020078458.

Claim 1 has been amended for clarity. Amended claim 1 recites a vehicle seat for supporting a passenger. The seat comprises:

a seat frame;

a video monitor mounted on the seat frame; and

a digital processor for processing a digital input for display on the video monitor, the digital processor programmed with image editing software for allowing a passenger to add new image content to images from the digital input without having to connect an external image processing device.

The vehicle seat of claim 1 is not limited to any particular type of vehicle. As but one example, the vehicle seat of claim 1 may be used in a commercial aircraft for in-flight entertainment. Airline companies have long sought ways of keeping passengers occupied during long flights. The vehicle seat of claim 1 provides a form of entertainment for those passengers who don't travel with their notebooks or don't want to unpack their notebooks. Moreover, the vehicle seat of claim 1 makes it more convenient to edit images than a notebook, since the frame-mounted video monitor doesn't occupy a tray table or a passenger's lap.

Brady discloses an In-Flight Entertainment (IFE) system including a line replaceable unit (LRU) 100 mounted in close proximity to a seat 750 and connected between a user interface 200 and a network 1500 (see Fig. 1a). The LRU 100 provides audio to a passenger. An LRU 150 may provide video to an optional display 650 mounted to a seat back 700 (see Figure 1b). A network server 450 may be located on

the LRU 150 (col. 9, lines 3-6). The server 450 presumably serves video to the display 650.

The LRU 100 “is, in an embodiment, a seat electronics box 2160” (col. 8, lines 57-59). The seat electronics box 2160 allows a passenger to connect a laptop computer into the network (col. 15, lines 18+). Brady does not teach or suggest that the laptop is connected to the optional display.

Regardless, Brady does not teach or suggest an IFE system that allows passengers to perform image editing. Page 3 of the office action acknowledges that Brady’s IFE system does not have image editing capability.

Furon describes a multimedia console 8 that accepts images from an external source such as a digital camera or server 1, and is equipped with an image processing program that can zoom in on, rotate, or otherwise transform an original image. The image processing program allows a user to select images for reconstitution or, what page 7 of the office action refers to as “image work.” The multimedia console 8 also prompts the user to select a desired fixed kiosk 5, and it transmits the selected images to the selected fixed kiosk 5. Furon describes image reconstitution as printing the images, burning a CD or otherwise transferring the images to a physical medium (see paragraph 23). Image reconstitution is performed at a fixed kiosk 5, not a multimedia console 8 (paragraph 23).

Furon does not describe image editing software. In any event, it does not describe image editing software that adds new image content. Claim 1 has been amended to clarify this distinction.

Furon does not suggest the addition of image editing features to Brady’s IFE system. Furon describes a mobile system for ordering images, not a system for editing images.

Thus, the combined teachings of Brady and Furon do not produce a seat having all of the features recited in base claim 1. Therefore, the '103 rejection of base claim 1 and its dependent claims 2-17 should be withdrawn.

Base claim 18 has also been amended to clarify that the image editing includes adding image content. Amended base claim 18 recites an aircraft comprising:

- a fuselage having a passenger cabin; and
- a plurality of passenger seats mounted within the cabin, at least one of the seats comprising:
 - a seat frame;
 - a video monitor mounted on the seat frame; and
 - a digital processor operatively connected to the video monitor for processing a digital input for display as an image on the video monitor, the digital processor programmed with image editing software for allowing a passenger to add new image content to any one or more images from the digital input.

Neither Brady nor Furon describes image editing software that adds new image content. For this reason alone, the '103 rejection of base claim 18 should be withdrawn.

The '103 rejection of base claim 18 should be withdrawn for another reason: there is no rationale for modifying an aircraft IFE system. The office action alleges:

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the capabilities of Furon's multimedia console in the in-flight entertainment system taught by Brady in order to allow a user to organize and edit photos while traveling in a vehicle for the benefit of saving the user time and optimizing the ordering process for image work.

The rationale might apply to a car, but not to an aircraft. The aircraft is not going to fly to a selected kiosk. Therefore, no user time will be saved and the ordering process will not be optimized by displaying images aboard an aircraft.

The '103 rejection of amended claims 8, 19 and 20 should be withdrawn for an additional reason. These dependent claims recite image editing software that allows a passenger to add new image content to images supplied by an aircraft camera. The office action alleges that this feature is described by the combination of Delorme U.S. Patent No. 6,321,158 and Brunner U.S. Publication No. 20020067424. We respectfully disagree. DeLorme merely discloses "[r]elative to specific geographic locations, personal snapshots or video, voice/audio experiences recorded on tape or text recollections can be input, stored and recalled, utilizing the present invention as a digital travel album." Brunner merely describes aircraft-mounted camera systems can provide in-flight entertainment to cabin passengers (paragraph 2). Both are silent about a system that allows passengers to add image content to images supplied by an aircraft camera. For this additional reason, the '103 rejection of dependent claims 8 and 19-20 should be withdrawn.

New claim 21 recites that the image editing software allows a passenger to add text and merge images. Support for this feature is provided in Figure 5 and page 5, last paragraph of the specification. Furon and the other documents made of record do not suggest such image editing.

Claim 7 has been cancelled. Therefore, an added claims fee has not been incurred by the addition of new claim 21.

The Examiner is strongly encouraged to contact the undersigned to discuss any remaining issues before mailing another office action.

Respectfully submitted,

/Hugh Gortler #33,890/

Hugh P. Gortler

Reg. No. 33,890

(949) 454-0898

Date: June 2, 2010